

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 24 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed May 23, 2006. This amendment is timely filed on November 24, 2006 with a three month extension of time, as November 23, 2006 was Thanksgiving, a federal holiday.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McLaughlin et al. (5,988,847) and Nazem et al. (5,983,227) and Michel K. Bowman-Amuah (6,742,015), in view of Robert S. Mason (5,884,098). Claims 1-60 are currently pending. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

At the outset, the Examiner will note that claim 1 has been amended to recite:

~~retrieving at least one but not all~~ only some of the plurality of blocks defined in the script of the requested document from a memory, the memory storing the at least one of the plurality of blocks defined in the script of the requested document; and

dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks defined in the script of the requested document that are not stored in the memory and storing a copy of each dynamically generated block in the memory.

Therefore, the offending "at least one but not all" has been removed from the claim. Instead, the claims now reads "retrieving only some of the plurality of blocks... from a memory.." and "dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks ... not stored in the memory...". Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in Figs. 5 and 6 and the corresponding written description thereof. Therefore, the claim requires that only some of the blocks be retrieved from the memory and that remaining ones of the plurality of blocks be dynamically generated. The "only some" recitation precludes any interpretation in which all blocks are retrieved from the memory and in which none of the blocks are dynamically generated. The claimed embodiment, therefore, requires two actions: 1) retrieving only some of

the blocks from the memory and 2) dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks. The applied combination does not teach or suggest such a method.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to recite that "only some of the plurality of blocks" are retrieved from a memory and "remaining ones of the plurality of blocks ... that are not stored in the memory" are dynamically generated. Thus, each of the independent claims requires that only some of the blocks be retrieved from a memory and that all remaining blocks defined in the script be dynamically generated.

The applied combination, however, does not teach or suggest that only some of the blocks be retrieved from a memory and that all remaining blocks defined in the script be dynamically generated, as claimed herein. Indeed, the primary reference to McLaughlin teaches an all or nothing approach to serving a client application with process data:

When a client application requires process data, a data request is sent to supervisory controller 120 and is received in cache manager 220. In one embodiment of the present invention, cache manager 220 first searches dynamic cache 10 220 for the requested process data. If the process data is found (a cache hit), cache manager 220 transfers the process data to the requesting client application and the transaction is ended. If the data is not found (a cache miss), cache manager 220 then requests the process data from the appropriate one of process nodes 204-206. When the supervisory 15 controller 120 receives the process data from the process node, cache manager 215 writes the process data into dynamic cache 215 and transfers the process data to the client application that originally requested it.

as shown in Column 8, lines 6-19. Either process data is present in the cache 220 or it is fetched from one of the process nodes 204-206. No provisions are made within McLaughlin for retrieving only some of the blocks from the memory and dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks. Alternatively, McLaughlin teaches that process data may be obtained in a peer-to-peer fashion, as detailed in Column 6, lines 22-25 or via a publish/subscribe model, as detailed in Column 3, lines 55-57.

Similarly, all of the supervisory data is dynamically generated, as positively stated in Column 5, lines 33-36:

optimize the facility as a whole. In a preferred embodiment, the supervisory data is dynamically generated and is based at least upon a given facility's efficiency, production or economic cost, and most preferably all three. 35

i.e., none of the supervisory data is retrieved from a cache memory. Therefore, McLaughlin does not teach or suggest retrieving only some of the blocks from the memory and dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks, as required by the claims.

The outstanding Office Action states that Nazem et al. teaches a document that includes a plurality of blocks. However, Nazem et al. does not remedy the fundamental shortcomings of the primary reference and does not teach – alone or in combination with McLaughlin – to retrieve only some of the blocks from the memory and to dynamically generate remaining ones of the plurality of blocks, as claimed herein. Indeed, Nazem et al. teaches the use of templates to hold the static data and to obtain all live data from the shared memory 212:

in further detail. User front page 218 is built according to a user template and live data. The user template specifies, for example which quotes are shown in the portfolio module, which cities are displayed in the weather module, etc. Each of the modules 504 can be customized by a user and moved about front page 218. The modules 504 are also reusable, in that any customized module which appears on multiple pages can be edited from any one of those pages and the edits will be reflected on each of the pages. Other custom pages for the user can be viewed by selecting one of the page buttons 502 appearing below the header. Other pages and utilities can be selected using the buttons 508 which are part of the header. 55 60 65

In addition to all of the live data shown in FIG. 5 being stored in the shared memory, summaries from each of the

as stated in line 66-67 above. Nazem et al. teaches that the template data is stored (and necessarily retrieved from) the cached user templates database 214 and that all of the live data to fill these templates is stored in (and necessarily retrieved from) the shared memory 212. Therefore, even when considered collectively with the McLaughlin reference, Nazem et al. does

not teach or suggest to retrieve only some of the blocks from the memory and to dynamically generate remaining ones of the plurality of blocks, as required by each of the independent claims herein. It is respectfully submitted that adding the Bowman-Amuah reference to the mix does not provide any additional guidance to the person of ordinary skill in this art. The cited passages simply do not teach anything relevant to blocks of a document including a reference to a data source and code that is configured to access and format data accessed from the data sources, as required by the claims. Indeed, Column 52, lines 55-61 deals with ID and password pairs:

55 resources, as opposed to securing an applications detailed functions.

The security component prevents unauthorized users from accessing corporate data/resources by providing the users with access codes—password & ID—that allows the user to
60 login to the system or execute any (or a particular) application.

while Column 47, lines 30-67 deals with wholly unrelated performance issues:

How important is performance? 30

In general, performance of data access and printing should be considered. Some typical benchmark tests include table scan, single-table report, joined table report, and mailing label generation times. (source is market research)

What is the budget? 35

Per developer costs as well as run time licensing fees, maintenance costs, support fees, and upgrade charges should be considered.

Do I have another component that satisfies this requirement? 40

Many databases and application development tools are shipped with built in or add-on report writing capability. However, stand-alone report writers: (1) are more powerful and flexible, especially when dealing with multiple data sources and a wide variety of formats; (2) can retrieve information from more data sources than the bundled report writers and can create reports from several data sources simultaneously; (3) excel in ease of use, both in designing and generating reports; (4) offer better tools and more predefined reports; and (5) have faster engines. (source is market research) 45 50

Does the product integrate with the existing or proposed architecture?

It is important to consider how well a product integrates with desktop tools (word processing, spreadsheet, graphics etc.) and application development programs. These items can be used to extend the capabilities of the reporting package. 55

What databases does the product support? 60

A product should support the most widely used PC file formats and Client/Server databases. It may be necessary to consider the type of support. For example, native database interfaces tend to have better performance than open standards such as ODBC. Another possible consideration is how well the product accesses multiple files or databases. (source is market research) 65

Next, the Office turns to Mason, Jr. for a supposed teaching of “retrieving at least one but not all of the plurality of blocks, and generating remaining blocks”, and points to Col. 8, lines 1-28 and Col. 9, lines 1-30 in support of its §103(a) rejection. However, Mason, Jr., whether considered alone or in combination with McLaughlin et al., Nazem et al. (5,983,227) and/or Bowman-Amuah does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Indeed, Mason, Jr. teaches a RAID controller system, and not a method of servicing a request for a document over a computer network, as claimed. Mason, Jr. teaches, at Col. 8, lines 1-30 referred to by the Examiner, that in case of a read operation failure, the data is reconstructed using a corresponding parity block of the stripe in which the failure occurred. The back end cache must then determine whether the parity block has already been cached by referring to a back end cache block list. If it is, then a read I/O operation may be avoided. Any remaining blocks of the stripe are read and cached in a front end cache. Then all blocks of the stripe in which the failure occurred are XORed together with the parity block, whereupon valid data is passed to the front end cache. No teaching or suggestion are present in this passage of Mason, Jr., whether considered alone or in combination with the other references, that would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed embodiments – that is, to retrieve only some of the blocks from the memory and to dynamically generate remaining ones of the plurality of blocks.

Next, the Office points to Col. 9, lines 1-30 of Mason, Jr.. This passage teaches a write command in which a list of valid blocks is checked. The list (see Col. 8, lines 56-61) accompanies a write command received from a host, includes the new blocks to be written to the RAID array. Mason, Jr. teaches, in Col. 9, beginning at line 4, teaches that if some old blocks to

be written are missing from the list (meaning that a cache miss has occurred), they are retrieved from the physical disk and stored into the front end cache. In essence, Mason, Jr. teaches that if blocks to be written are missing from the list, they are retrieved from the physical disks. At the outset, kindly note that this reference only teaches operations carried out within a RAID array of hard disk drives, and does not teach servicing a request for a document over any computer network. Moreover, note that Mason, Jr. teaches that if blocks to be written are missing from the list, they are retrieved from the physical disks, which cannot be considered to teach or to suggest dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks ... that are not stored in the memory. When blocks are missing from the list of blocks to be written, Mason, Jr. teaches simply to retrieve them from the disk. The claimed embodiment, on the other hand, requires dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks, which is unsuggested by Mason, Jr., whether considered alone or in combination with the other constituent references of the applied combination. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the skilled artisan would not look to or find any guidance in a patent relating to a RAID controller when seeking to develop a method for servicing requests for documents over a computer network, as is the Mason, Jr. patent.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied combination, therefore, does not teach or suggest any method, system or media configured to:

~~retrieving at least one but not all~~ only some of the plurality of blocks defined in the script of the requested document from a memory, the memory storing the at least one of the plurality of blocks defined in the script of the requested document; and

dynamically generating remaining ones of the plurality of blocks defined in the script of the requested document that are not stored in the memory and storing a copy of each dynamically generated block in the memory.

as claimed in independent claims 1, 19 and 37. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding art rejections based upon the four-way combination of McLaughlin, Nazem et al., Bowman-Amuah and Mason, Jr. are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 55 and 57-60 were rejected as being unpatentable over McLaughlin et al. and Nazem et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

As the Office will note, claim 55 has been amended to recite:

servicing the request for the Web page at least partially from the
cached blocks in memory by assembling the requested Web page by
retrieving only some of the cached blocks of the requested Web page
from the memory and generating all remaining blocks of the requested
Web page that were not retrieved from the memory.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the above comments relative to McLaughlin et al. and Nazem et al. are also applicable to claim 55. Rather than repeated these arguments here, they are hereby incorporated herein by reference as if they had been repeated here in full. Claim 57 has been canceled.

As the rejections of the independent claims are deemed to have been overcome, it is not believed necessary to discuss the rejections of the dependent claims at this time, as they incorporate the patentable features of the independent claims from which they depend.

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance. If any unresolved issues remain, please contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number indicated below and whatever is necessary to resolve such issues will be done at once.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov. 24, 2006

By: 

Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

\\Ylfserver\y\l\CLIENTS\ORCL\5680\5680 AMEND.3.doc